

Appl. No. 09/914,966
Atty. Docket No. 7456R
Amendment Dated October 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action Dated September 16, 2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 11, 29 and 30 have been amended to define the claimed invention with greater specificity by defining the fiber of the claimed invention as comprising starch and a high molecular weight polymer and having an average fiber diameter of less than 10 μm . Support for these amendments is found in Specification, especially at page 17, lines 1-3, and page 24, lines 10-14.

Claims 11-18 and 20-32 are pending. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejections Under §103:

Claims 11-13, 15-18 and 20-32 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent No. 4,243,480 to Hernandez et al. ("Hernandez"). The Examiner asserts that Hernandez teaches starch fibers having a diameter of 10-500 microns that are made via a solvent spinning process (not melt blowing and/or spunbonding). Hernandez teaches that water-insoluble synthetic polymers may be incorporated into the starch fiber. Col. 9, lines 31-34.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11, 29 and 30 are not rendered obvious over Hernandez because Hernandez fails to teach each and every element of Claims 11, 29 and 30, as amended. More specifically, Applicants submit that Hernandez fails to teach fibers comprising starch and a water-soluble synthetic polymer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11, 29 and 30, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Hernandez. MPEP 2143.03. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 12-13, 15-18 and 20-28, which ultimately depend from Claim 11, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Hernandez. MPEP 2143.03.

Claim 14 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Hernandez in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,516,815 to Buehler et al. ("Buehler").

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14, which ultimately depends from Claim 11, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Hernandez alone or in combination with Buehler for the same reason that Claim 11, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Hernandez. MPEP 2143.03.

Appl. No. 09/914,966
Atty. Docket No. 7456R
Amendment Dated October 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action Dated September 16, 2005
Customer No. 27752


Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 11-18 and 20-32 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 
C. Brant Cook
Registration No. 39,151
Tele. No. (513) 634-1533

October 21, 2005
Customer No. 27752